arXiv:1408.2097v4 [math.LO] 14 Mar 2015

On continuous Polish group actions and equivalence relations

Nikolaos E. Sofronidis*

Department of Economics, University of Ioannina, Ioannina 45110, Greece.
(nsofron@otenet.gr, nsofron@cc.uoi.gr)

Abstract

Let $X=\left\{P\in[0,1]^{\mathbf{N}}:(\forall\nu\in\mathbf{N})\left(P\left(\{\nu\}\right)>0\right)\wedge\sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty}P\left(\{\nu\}\right)=1\right\}$ be the Polish space of probability measures on $\mathbf{N}$, each of which assigns positive probability to every elementary event, while for any $P\in X$, let $\Gamma_P=\left\{\xi\in L^1(\mathbf{N},P):(\forall\nu\in\mathbf{N})\left(\xi(\nu)>0\right)\wedge\sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty}\xi(\nu)P\left(\{\nu\}\right)=1\right\}$ and let $\Phi_P:\Gamma_P\ni\xi\mapsto\Phi_P(\xi)\in X$ be defined by the relation $\left(\Phi_P(\xi)\right)\left(\{\nu\}\right)=\xi(\nu)P\left(\{\nu\}\right)$, whenever $\nu\in\mathbf{N}$. If we consider the equivalence relation $E=\left\{(P,Q)\in X^2:(\exists\xi\in\Gamma_P)\left(Q=\Phi_P(\xi)\right)\right\}$, the Polish space $\mathbf{P}=\left\{\mathbf{x}\in\ell^1\left(\mathbf{R}\right):(\forall n\in\mathbf{N})\left(\mathbf{x}(n)>0\right)\right\}$ and the commutative Polish group $\mathbf{G}=\left\{\mathbf{g}\in(0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}}:\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{g}(n)=1\right\}$, while we set $\left(\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{x}\right)(n)=\mathbf{g}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)$, whenever $\mathbf{g}\in\mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{P}$ and $n\in\mathbf{N}$, then E is definable and it admits a strong approximation by the turbulent Polish group action of $\mathbf{G}$ on $\mathbf{P}$. In addition, if we consider the Polish space $\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)=\left\{\mathbf{x}\in\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}\right):(\forall n\in\mathbf{N})\left(\mathbf{x}(n)\neq0\right)\right\}$ and we set $\mathbf{H}=\left\{\mathbf{h}\in\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)^{\mathbf{N}}:\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{h}(n)=1\right\}$, while $\left(\mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x}\right)(n)=\mathbf{h}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)$, whenever $\mathbf{h}\in\mathbf{H}$, $\mathbf{x}\in\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$ and $n\in\mathbf{N}$, then $\mathbf{H}$ is a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication and $\mathbf{H}\times\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)\ni(\mathbf{h},\mathbf{x})\mapsto\mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x}\in\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action each orbit of which is dense and meager, while $\mathbf{G}$ on $\mathbf{P}$ is a subaction of $\mathbf{H}$ on $\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$. In addition, if λ is the Lebesgue measure

*$A\Sigma MA$: 130/2543/94

in the real line and we consider the Polish space $L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda) = \{f \in L^1((0,\infty),\lambda) : f > 0,\ \lambda - a.e.\}$, while we consider the set $\mathbf{F} = \left\{f \in C((0,\infty),(0,\infty)) : \lim_{x\to 0} f(x) = \lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) = 1\right\}$ and the operation $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x)g(x)$, whenever $f \in \mathbf{F}$, $g \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ and $x \in (0,\infty)$, then $\mathbf{F}$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication and $\mathbf{F} \times L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda) \ni (f,g) \mapsto f \cdot g \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action, which is not an extension of the turbulent Polish group action of the group $\mathbf{G}^* = \left\{\mathbf{g} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}^*} : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{g}(n) = 1\right\}$, which is essentially $\mathbf{G}$, on the space $\mathbf{P}^* = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}^*} : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{x}(n) < \infty\right\}$, which is essentially $\mathbf{P}$, even though $\mathbf{G}^*$, $\mathbf{P}^*$ are Polish subspaces of $\mathbf{F}$, $L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ respectively.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 03E15, 22A99, 40A99.

1 Introduction

The following is a modification of the one given in [2].

1.1. Definition. If X is any Polish space and E is any definable equivalence relation on X, then E admits a strong approximation by a Polish group action, when the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) For any $x \in X$, there exists a Polish space Γ_x and a continuous mapping $\phi_x : \Gamma_x \to X$ such that $x \mapsto \Gamma_x$ and $x \mapsto \phi_x$ are definable, while $\phi_x[\Gamma_x] = [x]_E$.

(ii) There exists a Polish group G acting continuously on a Polish space P with the property that $X \subseteq P$ and for any $x \in X$, there exists a Polish space Δ_x such that Γ_x is a Polish subspace of Δ_x and $x \mapsto \Delta_x$ is definable, while $\Gamma_x \subseteq \overline{\Delta_x \cap G}$ and $\phi_x(g) = g \cdot x$, whenever $g \in \Gamma_x \cap G$.

(iii) For any $x \in X$ and for any $\gamma \in \Gamma_x$, there exists a homeomorphism $\psi_{x,\gamma} : \Gamma_x \to \Gamma_{\phi_x(\gamma)}$ with the property that $(x,\gamma) \mapsto \psi_{x,\gamma}$ is definable and $\phi_x(\delta) = \phi_{\phi_x(\gamma)}(\psi_{x,\gamma}(\delta))$, whenever $\delta \in \Gamma_x$.

The following is introduced in [1].

1.2. Definition. Let G be any Polish group with countable base $\mathcal{B}_G$ acting continuously on a Polish space X with countable base $\mathcal{B}_X$ and let

$$xE_G^X y \iff (\exists g \in G)\,(g \cdot x = y)\,,$$

whenever x, y are in X. For any open neighborhood $U \in \mathcal{B}_X$ of x and for any symmetric open neighborhood $V \in \mathcal{B}_G$ of 1^G, the (U,V)-local orbit $O(x,U,V)$ of x in X is defined, as follows:

> $y \in O(x,U,V)$ if there exist g_0, ..., g_k in V, where $k \in \mathbf{N}$, such that if $x_0 = x$ and $x_{i+1} = g_i \cdot x_i$ for every $i \in \{0,...,k\}$, then all the x_i are in U and $x_{k+1} = y$.

The action of G on X is said to be turbulent at the point x, in symbols $x \in T_G^X$, if for any such U and V, there exists an open neighborhood $U' \in \mathcal{B}_X$ of x such that $U' \subseteq U$ and $O(x,U,V)$ is dense in U'.

1.3. Definition. Let

$$X = \left\{ P \in [0,1]^{\mathbf{N}} : (\forall \nu \in \mathbf{N})\,(P(\{\nu\}) > 0) \wedge \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} P(\{\nu\}) = 1 \right\}$$

be the Polish space of probability measures on $\mathbf{N}$, each of which assigns positive probability to every elementary event. (It is a G_δ subset of the compact Polish space $[0,1]^{\mathbf{N}}$ equipped with the product topology.) For any $P \in X$, let

$$\Gamma_P = \left\{ \xi \in L^1(\mathbf{N},P) : (\forall \nu \in \mathbf{N})\,(\xi(\nu) > 0) \wedge \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \xi(\nu) P(\{\nu\}) = 1 \right\}$$

be the Polish space of positive L^1 random variables on the probability measure space $(\mathbf{N}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N}), P)$ whose expectation is equal to 1 (it is a G_δ subset of the $C2$ Banach space $L^1(\mathbf{N},P)$) and let $\Phi_P : \Gamma_P \ni \xi \mapsto \Phi_P(\xi) \in X$ be defined by the relation $(\Phi_P(\xi))(\{\nu\}) = \xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\})$, whenever $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$. We set

$$E = \left\{ (P,Q) \in X^2 : (\exists \xi \in \Gamma_P)\,(Q = \Phi_P(\xi)) \right\}.$$

The following is proved in [3].

1.4. Theorem. If $\mathbf{P} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{R}) : (\forall n \in \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{x}(n) > 0)\}$ and

$$\mathbf{G} = \left\{\mathbf{g} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}} : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{g}(n) = 1\right\},$$

while $(\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{x})(n) = \mathbf{g}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)$, whenever $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then the following hold true:

(i) $\mathbf{G}$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication.

(ii) $\mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{P} \ni (\mathbf{g},\mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action.

(iii) The action of $\mathbf{G}$ on $\mathbf{P}$ is turbulent.

So our first purpose in this article is to prove the following.

1.5. Theorem. *E is definable and it admits a strong approximation by the turbulent Polish group action of $\mathbf{G}$ on $\mathbf{P}$.*

1.6. Definition. If $\mathbf{C}^* = \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\}$, then we set

$$\ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*) = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}) : (\forall n \in \mathbf{N})(\mathbf{x}(n) \neq 0)\right\},$$

which is a G_δ subset of the $C2$ Banach space

$$\ell^1(\mathbf{C}) = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{N}} : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\mathbf{x}(n)| < \infty\right\}$$

and consequently it constitutes a Polish space.

So our second purpose in this article is to prove the following.

1.7. Theorem. If

$$\mathbf{H} = \left\{\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbf{C}^*)^{\mathbf{N}} : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{h}(n) = 1\right\},$$

while $(\mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x})(n) = \mathbf{h}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)$, whenever $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbf{H}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then the following hold true:

(i) $\mathbf{H}$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication and $\mathbf{G}$ is a Polish subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$.

(ii) $\mathbf{H} \times \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*) \ni (\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action and $\mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{P} \ni (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}$ is a subaction.

(iii) For any $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$, $\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is dense in $\ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$.

(iv) For any $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$, $\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is meager in $\ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$.

The following Polish space is due to Tom Wolff and is introduced in [2]. It is a G_δ subset of a closed subset of a Polish space. See (i) of Proposition 5.6 on page 1470 of [2].

1.8. Definition. If λ is the Lebesgue measure in the real line, then we set $L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda) = \{f \in L^1((0,\infty),\lambda) : f > 0,\ \lambda - a.e.\}$.

So, following [3], our third purpose in this article is to prove the following.

1.9. Theorem. If $\mathbf{F} = \left\{ f \in C((0,\infty),(0,\infty)) : \lim_{x\to 0} f(x) = \lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) = 1 \right\}$ and $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x)g(x)$, whenever $f \in \mathbf{F}$, $g \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ and $x \in (0,\infty)$, then the following hold true:

(i) $\mathbf{F}$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication.

(ii) $\mathbf{F} \times L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda) \ni (f,g) \mapsto f \cdot g \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action.

An immediate consequence of [3] is the following.

1.10. Theorem. If $\mathbf{P}^* = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}^*} : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{x}(n) < \infty \right\}$ and

$$\mathbf{G}^* = \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}^*} : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{g}(n) = 1 \right\},$$

while $(\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x})(n) = \mathbf{g}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)$, whenever $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{G}^*$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}^*$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}^*$, then the following hold true:

(i) $\mathbf{G}^*$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under pointwise multiplication.

(ii) $\mathbf{G}^* \times \mathbf{P}^* \ni (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}^*$ constitutes a continuous Polish group action.

(iii) The action of $\mathbf{G}^*$ on $\mathbf{P}^*$ is turbulent.

1.11. Definition. If $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{G}^*$, then we set

$$f_{\mathbf{g}}(x) = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{g}(n+1) - \mathbf{g}(n))(x-n) + \mathbf{g}(n) & \text{if } x \in [n, n+1] \text{ and } n \in \mathbf{N}^* \\ 2(\mathbf{g}(1) - 1)(x-1) + \mathbf{g}(1) & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \end{cases}$$

and it is not difficult to verify that $f_{\mathbf{g}} \in C((0,\infty),(0,\infty))$ due to the fact that $\mathbf{g} \in (0,\infty)^{\mathbf{N}^*}$ and $(0,\infty)^2$ is convex, while obviously $\lim_{x\to 0} f_{\mathbf{g}}(x) = 1$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} f_{\mathbf{g}}(x) = 1$, since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{g}(n) = 1$ and $(0,\infty)^2$ is convex, i.e., $f_{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbf{F}$.

So, our fourth purpose in this article is to prove the following.

1.12. Theorem. $\mathbf{G}^* \ni \mathbf{g} \mapsto f_{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbf{F}$ is a Polish space continuous injection, but not a Polish group continuous injection.

1.13. Remark. If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{P}^*$, then we set

$$g_{\mathbf{x}}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(n) & \text{if } x \in [n, n+1) \text{ and } n \in \mathbf{N}^* \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in (0,1) \end{cases}$$

and it is not difficult to verify that $g_{\mathbf{x}} \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ and $\|g_{\mathbf{x}}\|_1 = 1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$, so $\mathbf{P}^* \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto g_{\mathbf{x}} \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ is a Polish space continuous injection.

2 The proof of 1.5

2.1 The proof of (i) in 1.1

If $\xi^k \to \xi$ in Γ_P as $k \to \infty$, then for any $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\Phi_P\left(\xi^k\right)\right)(\{\nu\}) - \left(\Phi_P(\xi)\right)(\{\nu\})\right| &= \left|\xi^k(\{\nu\})\,P(\{\nu\}) - \xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\})\right| \\ &= \left|\xi^k(\nu) - \xi(\nu)\right| P(\{\nu\}) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left|\xi^k(n) - \xi(n)\right| P(\{n\}) \\ &= \left\|\xi^k - \xi\right\|_1 \to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $k \to \infty$, so for any $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$, we have that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\Phi_P\left(\xi^k\right)\right)(\{\nu\}) = \left(\Phi_P(\xi)\right)(\{\nu\})$$

and consequently $\Phi_P\left(\xi^k\right) \to \Phi_P(\xi)$ in X as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, if $(P,Q) \in E$ and $\xi \in \Gamma_P$ is such that $Q = \Phi_P(\xi)$, then $\frac{1}{\xi} \in \Gamma_Q$ and $P = \Phi_Q\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)$. Indeed, $\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)} > 0$ for every $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}Q(\{\nu\}) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}\Phi_P(\{\nu\}) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = 1$, hence $\frac{1}{\xi} \in \Gamma_Q$, while $\left(\Phi_Q\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)\right)(\{\nu\}) = \frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}Q(\{\nu\}) = \frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}\Phi_P(\{\nu\}) = \frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = P(\{\nu\})$ for every $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$. $\triangle$

2.2 The proof of (ii) in 1.1

We shall first prove that $\Gamma_P \subseteq \overline{L^1(\mathbf{N},P)\cap\mathbf{G}}$. Indeed, if $\xi \in \Gamma_P$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then there exists $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sum_{\nu>N}P(\{\nu\}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $\sum_{\nu>N}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, so if $\mathbf{g} = (\xi(0),...,\xi(N),1,1,...)$, then $\mathbf{g} \in L^1(\mathbf{N},P)\cap\mathbf{G}$ and $\|\xi-\mathbf{g}\|_1 = \sum_{\nu>N}|\xi(\nu)-1|\,P(\{\nu\}) \leq \sum_{\nu>N}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) + \sum_{\nu>N}P(\{\nu\}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}+\frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$. Moreover, for any $\mathbf{g} \in \Gamma_P \cap \mathbf{G}$, we have that $\Phi_P(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{g}\cdot P$, since $\left(\Phi_P(\mathbf{g})\right)(\{\nu\}) = \mathbf{g}(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = (\mathbf{g}\cdot P)(\nu)$ for every $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$. $\triangle$

2.3 The proof of (iii) in 1.1

If $P \in X$ and $\xi \in \Gamma_P$, then we define $\Psi_{P,\xi} : \Gamma_P \ni \zeta \mapsto \Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta) \in \Gamma_{\Phi_P(\xi)}$ by the relation $(\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta))(\nu) = \frac{\zeta(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)}$, whenever $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$. It is not difficult to see that $\sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta))(\nu)(\Phi_P(\xi))(\{\nu\}) = \sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = \sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \zeta(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = 1$ and $\frac{\zeta(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)} > 0$ for every $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$, so $\Psi_{P,\xi}$ is well-defined. In addition, if ζ_1, ζ_2 are any elements of Γ_P, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta_1) - \Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta_2)\|_1 \\
&= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} |(\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta_1))(\nu) - (\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta_2))(\nu)| (\Phi_P(\xi))(\{\nu\}) \\
&= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \left|\tfrac{\zeta_1(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)} - \tfrac{\zeta_2(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)}\right| \xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) \\
&= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} |\zeta_1(\nu) - \zeta_2(\nu)| P(\{\nu\}) \\
&= \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_1
\end{aligned}$$

and $\Psi_{P,\xi}^{-1} = \Psi_{P,\frac{1}{\xi}}$, since $\left(\Psi_{P,\frac{1}{\xi}}(\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta))\right)(\nu) = \frac{\frac{\zeta(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)}}{\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}} = \zeta(\nu)$, whenever $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$, while $\frac{1}{\xi} \in \Gamma_{\Phi_P(\xi)}$, since $\sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}(\Phi_P(\xi))(\{\nu\}) = \sum\limits_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\xi(\nu)}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = 1$ and $\frac{1}{\xi(\nu)} > 0$ for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$. So $\Psi_{P,\xi} : \Gamma_P \to \Gamma_{\Phi_P(\xi)}$ is an isometry. Moreover, if $\zeta \in \Gamma_P$, then $\left(\Phi_{\Phi_P(\xi)}(\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta))\right)(\{\nu\}) = (\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta))(\nu)(\Phi_P(\xi))(\{\nu\}) = \frac{\zeta(\nu)}{\xi(\nu)}\xi(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = \zeta(\nu)P(\{\nu\}) = (\Phi_P(\zeta))(\{\nu\})$, whenever $\nu \in \mathbf{N}$, hence $\Phi_{\Phi_P(\xi)}(\Psi_{P,\xi}(\zeta)) = \Phi_P(\zeta)$. $\triangle$

3 The proof of 1.7

3.1 The proof of (i) in 1.7

It is well-known that $\mathbf{C}^*$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under multiplication and if $d(x,y) = |x-y| + \left|\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{y}\right|$, whenever x and y are in $\mathbf{C}^*$, then d constitutes a complete compatible metric on $\mathbf{C}^*$. Given any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{H}$ and any $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbf{H}$, we set $\rho(\mathbf{g},\mathbf{h}) = \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}} d(\mathbf{g}(n),\mathbf{h}(n))$ and it is not difficult

to verify that ρ constitutes a metric on $\mathbf{H}$. So let $(\mathbf{h}_k)_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ be any Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbf{H},\rho)$ and let $\epsilon>0$. Then there exists $K\in\mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $k\geq K$ and for any integer $l\geq K$, we have $|\mathbf{h}_k(n)-\mathbf{h}_l(n)|\leq d\left(\mathbf{h}_k(n),\mathbf{h}_l(n)\right)\leq\rho\left(\mathbf{h}_k,\mathbf{h}_l\right)<\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, whenever $n\in\mathbf{N}$. So for any $n\in\mathbf{N}$, $(\mathbf{h}_k(n))_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ constitutes a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbf{C}^*,d)$ and consequently it has a limit, say $\mathbf{h}(n)=\lim\limits_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{h}_k(n)$. Moreover, since $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{h}_K(n)=1$, there exists $N\in\mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $n\geq N$, we have $|\mathbf{h}_K(n)-1|<\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and hence $|\mathbf{h}(n)-1|=\lim\limits_{l\to\infty}|\mathbf{h}_l(n)-1|\leq\sup\limits_{l\geq K}\left(|\mathbf{h}_l(n)-\mathbf{h}_K(n)|+|\mathbf{h}_K(n)-1|\right)\leq\sup\limits_{l\geq K}|\mathbf{h}_l(n)-\mathbf{h}_K(n)|+|\mathbf{h}_K(n)-1|<\epsilon$, while for any integer $k\geq K$ and for any $n\in\mathbf{N}$, we have $d\left(\mathbf{h}_k(n),\mathbf{h}(n)\right)=\lim\limits_{l\to\infty}d\left(\mathbf{h}_k(n),\mathbf{h}_l(n)\right)\leq\frac{\epsilon}{2}$, which implies that $\mathbf{h}\in\mathbf{H}$, hence $\rho\left(\mathbf{h}_k,\mathbf{h}\right)=\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}d\left(\mathbf{h}_k(n),\mathbf{h}(n)\right)\leq\frac{\epsilon}{2}<\epsilon$ and consequently $\mathbf{h}_k\to\mathbf{h}$ in $(\mathbf{H},\rho)$ as $k\to\infty$, which implies that ρ constitutes a complete metric on $\mathbf{H}$. If $\mathbf{f}$, $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{h}$ are any elements of $\mathbf{H}$, then it is not difficult to prove that $\rho\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{f}},\frac{1}{\mathbf{g}}\right)=\rho\left(\mathbf{f},\mathbf{g}\right)$, which implies that inversion is continuous, and

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{fh},\mathbf{gh}\right)\leq\max\left\{\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{h}(n)|,\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{h}(n)|}\right\}\rho\left(\mathbf{f},\mathbf{g}\right),$$

since $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{h}(n)=1$ and the same holds true for $\frac{1}{\mathbf{h}}$. So let $\mathbf{f}_k\to\mathbf{f}$ in $(\mathbf{H},\rho)$ as $k\to\infty$ and let $\mathbf{g}_k\to\mathbf{g}$ in $(\mathbf{H},\rho)$ as $k\to\infty$, while $\epsilon>0$. Then there exists $K\in\mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $k\geq K$, we have

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{g}_k,\mathbf{g}\right)<\frac{\epsilon}{2\max\left\{1+\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{f}(n)|,1+\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{f}(n)|}\right\}}$$

and

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{f}_k,\mathbf{f}\right)<\min\left\{\frac{\epsilon}{2\max\left\{\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{g}(n)|,\sup\limits_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|g(n)|}\right\}},1\right\},$$

so

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{f}_k(n)|\leq\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{f}_k(n)-\mathbf{f}(n)|+\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{f}(n)|<1+\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}|\mathbf{f}(n)|$$

and

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{f}_k(n)|}\leq\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{f}_k(n)}-\frac{1}{\mathbf{f}(n)}\right|+\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{f}(n)|}<1+\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{f}(n)|},$$

so

$$\rho\left(\mathbf{f}_k\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{fg}\right) \leq \rho\left(\mathbf{f}_k\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{f}_k\mathbf{g}\right) + \rho\left(\mathbf{f}_k\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{fg}\right)$$

$$\leq \max\left\{\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{f}_k(n)\right|, \sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\tfrac{1}{\left|\mathbf{f}_k(n)\right|}\right\}\rho\left(\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{g}\right)$$

$$+\max\left\{\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{g}(n)\right|, \sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\tfrac{1}{\left|\mathbf{g}(n)\right|}\right\}\rho\left(\mathbf{f}_k, \mathbf{f}\right)$$

$$< \epsilon.$$

So $\mathbf{H}$ constitutes a topological group whose topology is given by the complete metric ρ. What is left to show is that $(\mathbf{H}, \rho)$ is separable. Indeed, it is not difficult to verify that

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{\mathbf{g} \in \left(\left(\mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{Q}\right) \setminus \{0\}\right)^{\mathbf{N}} : \exists m \forall n \geq m \left(\mathbf{g}(n) = 1\right)\right\}$$

constitutes a countable dense subset of $(\mathbf{H}, \rho)$. $\triangle$

3.2 The proof of (ii) in 1.7

If $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$, then

$$\left\|\mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x}\right\|_1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left|\mathbf{h}(n)\mathbf{x}(n)\right|$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{h}(n)\right|\right)\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left|\mathbf{x}(n)\right|$$

$$= \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{h}(n)\right|\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_1$$

and since $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbf{H}$, the fact that $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$, implies that $\mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x} \in \ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$ and it is not difficult to verify that $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x}$ is a group action. So let $\mathbf{h}_k \to \mathbf{h}$ in $\mathbf{H}$ as $k \to \infty$ and $\mathbf{x}_k \to \mathbf{x}$ in $\ell^1\left(\mathbf{C}^*\right)$ as $k \to \infty$. Then

$$\left\|\mathbf{h}_k\cdot\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{h}\cdot\mathbf{x}\right\|_1 \leq \left\|\mathbf{h}_k\cdot\left(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\right)\right\|_1 + \left\|\left(\mathbf{h}_k - \mathbf{h}\right)\cdot\mathbf{x}\right\|_1$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{h}_k(n)\right|\right)\left\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\right\|_1 + \sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}}\left|\mathbf{h}_k(n) - \mathbf{h}(n)\right|\left\|\mathbf{x}\right\|_1$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} |\mathbf{h}_k(n)|\right) \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\|_1 + \rho(\mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} |\mathbf{h}_k(n) - \mathbf{h}(n)| + \sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} |\mathbf{h}(n)|\right) \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\|_1 + \rho(\mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_1$$

$$\leq \left(\rho(\mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}) + \sup_{n\in\mathbf{N}} |\mathbf{h}(n)|\right) \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\|_1 + \rho(\mathbf{h}_k, \mathbf{h}) \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$. △

3.3 The proof of (iii) in 1.7

It is enough to notice that if $\mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$ and $N \in \mathbf{N}$, while

$$\mathbf{h}_N(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{y}(n)}{\mathbf{x}(n)} & \text{if } n \in \{0, ..., N\} \\ \\ 1 & \text{if } n \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0, ..., N\} \end{cases}$$

then $\mathbf{h}_N \in \mathbf{H}$ and $\|\mathbf{h}_N \cdot \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_1 = \sum\limits_{n>N} |\mathbf{x}(n) - \mathbf{y}(n)| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. △

3.4 The proof of (iv) in 1.7

If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{x}$, then it is not difficult to verify that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{y}(n)}{\mathbf{x}(n)} = 1$ and consequently there exists $m \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $n \geq m$, we have $\left|\frac{\mathbf{y}(n)}{\mathbf{x}(n)}\right| \leq \frac{3}{2}$. So $\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{x} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, where

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{m\in\mathbf{N}} \bigcap_{n\geq m} \left\{\mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*) : \left|\frac{\mathbf{y}(n)}{\mathbf{x}(n)}\right| \leq \frac{3}{2}\right\}$$

is easily verified to be F_σ. So it is enough to prove that $\ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*) \setminus \mathcal{M}$ is dense in $\ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$. Indeed, if $\mathbf{z} \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*)$ and $N \in \mathbf{N}$, while

$$\mathbf{z}_N(n) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}(n) & \text{if } n \in \{0, ..., N\} \\ \\ 2\mathbf{x}(n) & \text{if } n \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0, ..., N\} \end{cases}$$

then it is enough to notice that $\mathbf{z}_N \in \ell^1(\mathbf{C}^*) \setminus \mathcal{M}$ and

$$\|\mathbf{z}_N - \mathbf{z}\|_1 = \sum_{n>N} |2\mathbf{x}(n) - \mathbf{z}(n)| \to 0$$

as $N \to \infty$. △

4 The proof of 1.9

4.1 The proof of (i)

It is well-known that $(0,\infty)$ constitutes a commutative Polish group under multiplication and if $d(x,y) = |x-y| + \left|\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{y}\right|$, whenever x and y are in $(0,\infty)$, then d constitutes a complete compatible metric on $(0,\infty)$. Given any $f \in \mathbf{F}$ and any $g \in \mathbf{F}$, we set $\rho(f,g) = \sup_{x>0} d\left(f(x), g(x)\right)$ and it is not difficult to verify that ρ constitutes a metric on $\mathbf{F}$. So let $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ be any Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbf{F},\rho)$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists $K \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $k \geq K$ and for any integer $l \geq K$, we have $|f_k(x) - f_l(x)| \leq d\left(f_k(x), f_l(x)\right) \leq \rho\left(f_k, f_l\right) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, whenever $x > 0$. So for any $x > 0$, $(f_k(x))_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$ constitutes a Cauchy sequence in $\left((0,\infty), d\right)$ and consequently it has a limit, say $f(x) = \lim_{k\to\infty} f_k(x)$. Moreover, since $\lim_{x\to 0} f_K(x) = 1$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $x \in (0,\delta)$, we have $|f_K(x) - 1| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and hence $|f(x) - 1| = \lim_{l\to\infty} |f_l(x) - 1| \leq \sup_{l\geq K} \left(|f_l(x) - f_K(x)| + |f_K(x) - 1|\right) \leq \sup_{l\geq K} |f_l(x) - f_K(x)| + |f_K(x) - 1| < \epsilon$, and, in addition, since $\lim_{x\to\infty} f_K(x) = 1$, there exists $M > 0$ such that for any $x \geq M$, we have $|f_K(x) - 1| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and hence $|f(x) - 1| = \lim_{l\to\infty} |f_l(x) - 1| \leq \sup_{l\geq K} \left(|f_l(x) - f_K(x)| + |f_K(x) - 1|\right) \leq \sup_{l\geq K} |f_l(x) - f_K(x)| + |f_K(x) - 1| < \epsilon$, while for any integer $k \geq K$ and for any $x > 0$, we have $d\left(f_k(x), f(x)\right) = \lim_{l\to\infty} d\left(f_k(x), f_l(x)\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, which, given [4], implies that $f \in \mathbf{F}$, hence $\rho\left(f_k, f\right) = \sup_{x>0} d\left(f_k(x), f(x)\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$ and consequently $f_k \to f$ in $(\mathbf{F},\rho)$ as $k \to \infty$, which implies that ρ constitutes a complete metric on $\mathbf{F}$. If f, g and h are any elements of $\mathbf{F}$, then it is not difficult to prove that $\rho\left(\frac{1}{f}, \frac{1}{g}\right) = \rho(f,g)$, which implies that inversion is continuous, and

$$\rho(fh, gh) \leq \max\left\{\sup_{x>0} h(x), \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{h(x)}\right\} \rho(f,g),$$

since $\lim_{x\to 0} h(x) = \lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = 1$ and h being continuous on any compact interval it is also bounded, while the same hold true for $\frac{1}{h}$. So let $f_k \to f$ in $(\mathbf{F},\rho)$ as $k \to \infty$ and let $g_k \to g$ in $(\mathbf{F},\rho)$ as $k \to \infty$, while $\epsilon > 0$. Then there

exists $K \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for any integer $k \geq K$, we have

$$\rho\left(g_k, g\right) < \frac{\epsilon}{2\max\left\{1 + \sup\limits_{x>0} f(x), 1 + \sup\limits_{x>0} \frac{1}{f(x)}\right\}}$$

and

$$\rho\left(f_k, f\right) < \min\left\{\frac{\epsilon}{2\max\left\{\sup\limits_{x>0} g(x), \sup\limits_{x>0} \frac{1}{g(x)}\right\}}, 1\right\},$$

so

$$\sup_{x>0} f_k(x) \leq \sup_{x>0} \left|f_k(x) - f(x)\right| + \sup_{x>0} f(x) < 1 + \sup_{x>0} f(x)$$

and

$$\sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{f_k(x)} \leq \sup_{x>0} \left|\frac{1}{f_k(x)} - \frac{1}{f(x)}\right| + \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{f(x)} < 1 + \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{f(x)},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho\left(f_k g_k, fg\right) \leq \rho\left(f_k g_k, f_k g\right) + \rho\left(f_k g, fg\right) \\
&\leq \max\left\{\sup_{x>0} f_k(x), \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{f_k(x)}\right\} \rho\left(g_k, g\right) \\
&+ \max\left\{\sup_{x>0} g(x), \sup_{x>0} \frac{1}{g(x)}\right\} \rho\left(f_k, f\right) \\
&< \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

So $\mathbf{F}$ constitutes a topological group whose topology is given by the complete metric ρ and what is left to show is that $(\mathbf{F}, \rho)$ is separable. Given any integer $N \geq 2$, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_N$ the set of all ϕ with the property that there exists $P(X) \in \mathbf{Q}[X]$ with positive values on $\left[\frac{1}{N}, N\right]$ such that $\phi\left|\left[\frac{1}{N}, N\right]\right. = P\left|\left[\frac{1}{N}, N\right]\right.$ and $\phi\left|\left(\left(0, \frac{1}{2N}\right] \cup \left[N + \frac{1}{N}, \infty\right)\right)\right. = 1$, while $\frac{1}{2N} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{N} \Rightarrow \phi(x) = N\left(x - \frac{1}{N}\right)\left(1 - P\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)\right) + P\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$ and $N \leq x \leq N + \frac{1}{N} \Rightarrow \phi(x) = N(x - N)\left(1 - P(N)\right) + P(N)$, and let $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup\limits_{N \geq 2} \mathcal{C}_N$. It is not difficult to verify that $\mathcal{C}$ is countable and, given [4], that $\mathcal{C}$ is dense in $(\mathbf{F}, \rho)$. $\triangle$

4.2 The proof of (ii)

If $f \in \mathbf{F}$ and $g \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$, then

$$\|fg\|_1 = \int_0^\infty f(x)g(x)dx \leq \left(\sup_{x>0} f(x)\right)\int_0^\infty g(x)dx = \left(\sup_{x>0} f(x)\right)\|g\|_1$$

and since $f > 0$, the fact that $g > 0$, λ-a.e. implies that $fg > 0$, λ-a.e., so $fg \in L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ and it is not difficult to verify that $(f,g) \mapsto fg$ is a group action. So let $f_k \to f$ in $\mathbf{F}$ as $k \to \infty$ and $g_k \to g$ in $L^1_{++}((0,\infty),\lambda)$ as $k \to \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f_k g_k - fg\|_1 \leq \|f_k(g_k - g)\|_1 + \|(f_k - f)g\|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{x>0} f_k(x)\right)\|g_k - g\|_1 + \sup_{x>0}|f_k(x) - f(x)|\,\|g\|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{x>0} f_k(x)\right)\|g_k - g\|_1 + \rho(f_k, f)\,\|g\|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\sup_{x>0}|f_k(x) - f(x)| + \sup_{x>0} f(x)\right)\|g_k - g\|_1 + \rho(f_k, f)\,\|g\|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\rho(f_k, f) + \sup_{x>0} f(x)\right)\|g_k - g\|_1 + \rho(f_k, f)\,\|g\|_1 \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $k \to \infty$. △

5 The proof of 1.12

We denote by ρ^* the complete metric on $\mathbf{G}^*$. If $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{h}$ are any points of $\mathbf{G}^*$ such that $f_{\mathbf{g}} = f_{\mathbf{h}}$, then for any $n \in \mathbf{N}^*$, we have that $\mathbf{g}(n) = f_{\mathbf{g}}(n) = f_{\mathbf{h}}(n) = \mathbf{h}(n)$, so $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{h}$ and consequently we have an injection. So if $\mathbf{g}_k \to \mathbf{g}$ in $\mathbf{G}^*$ as $k \to \infty$, then given $n \in \mathbf{N}^*$ and $x \in [n, n+1]$, we have that $|f_{\mathbf{g}_k}(x) - f_{\mathbf{g}}(x)| \leq |\mathbf{g}_k(n+1) - \mathbf{g}(n+1)| \cdot |x - n| + |\mathbf{g}_k(n) - \mathbf{g}(n)| \cdot |x - (n+1)| \leq 2\rho^*(\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{g})$, while given $x \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$, we have that $|f_{\mathbf{g}_k}(x) - f_{\mathbf{g}}(x)| \leq |\mathbf{g}_k(1) - \mathbf{g}(1)| \cdot |2x - 1| \leq \rho^*(\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{g})$, hence $\sup_{x>0}|f_{\mathbf{g}_k}(x) - f_{\mathbf{g}}(x)| \leq 2\rho^*(\mathbf{g}_k, \mathbf{g}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and consequently $\rho(f_{\mathbf{g}_k}, f_{\mathbf{g}}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. So the injection in question is

continuous, but if $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{h}$ in $\mathbf{G}^*$ are such that $\mathbf{g}(1) \neq 1$, $\mathbf{h}(1) \neq 1$, then for any $x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, we have that $f_{\mathbf{g}}(x) f_{\mathbf{h}}(x) - f_{\mathbf{gh}}(x) = 2(x-1) \cdot (2x-1) \cdot (\mathbf{g}(1) - 1) \cdot (\mathbf{h}(1) - 1)$ and consequently $f_{\mathbf{g}}(x) f_{\mathbf{h}}(x) \neq f_{\mathbf{gh}}(x)$. $\triangle$

References

[1] G. Hjorth, Classification and orbit equivalence relations, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs* **75**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2000.

[2] A. S. Kechris and N. E. Sofronidis, A strong generic ergodicity property of unitary and self-adjoint operators, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **21** (2001), 1459-1479.

[3] N. E. Sofronidis, The equivalence relation of being of the same kind, *Real Analysis Exchange*, Volume 33(2), 2007/2008, 1-7.

[4] K. Weierstrass, Uber die analytische darstellbarkeit sogenannter willkurlicher functionen einer reellen veranderlichen, *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie zu Berlin* (1885), 633-639, 789-805.